



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
RIO TINTO PLC,

Plaintiff

v.

VALE, S.A., et al.

Defendants  
-----X

14 CV 3042 (RMB)

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER**

Following Defendants' earlier motion(s) to dismiss (based upon a forum selection clause and upon the doctrine of forum non conveniens) which were denied by the Court on December 17, 2014, the Court directed that there be no more than one additional joint motion to dismiss submitted by all Defendants and containing all asserted grounds for relief. Such grounds should include any merits claims and any jurisdictional claims, among any other claims. Mr. Filardo's 14-page letter, dated February 4, 2015, to Magistrate Judge Andrew J. Peck respectfully is confusing as it appears to describe three additional motions, i.e., one merits-based, one based upon personal jurisdiction, and one seeking a protective order. The first two of these should be part of the same joint motion (referenced above) and the third should be susceptible to resolution readily via good faith discussions with Plaintiff's counsel.

The Court is constrained to advise counsel that motions filed not in conformity with the Court's earlier directives and this Order will be rejected. (See also Hearing Tr., dated Jan. 20, 2015; Order, dated Jan. 16, 2015.)

Dated: New York, New York  
February 6, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD M. BERMAN, U.S.D.J.